Rhizome:
Jurnal Kajian Ilmu Ilmu Humaniora
Vol. 6 No. 1 January 2026 Hal. 12 – 21

Pancasila-Based Rationality in Social Life in the Era of Artificial Intelligence: Reconstructing the Citizenship Paradigm through Pancasila Philosophy

Yayuk Hidayah [a, 1*], Rr. Yudiswara Ayu Permatasari [b, 2], Nathasa Pramudita Irianti [c, 3], Meiwatizal Trihastuti [d, 4], Nindya Ferrtikasari [e, 5]

[a] Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia
[b] Institut Seni Indonesia Yogyakarta, Indonesia
[c] Politeknik Agraria STPN, Indonesia
[d] Sekolah Tinggi Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan Pasundan, Indonesia
[e] The Graduate School of Integrated Science and Technology, Shizuoka University (Japan National University)
[1] yayukhidayah@uny.ac.id*
*Corresponding author

Article information :
Received: 5 August 2026;
Revised: 9 July/August 2026;
Accepted: 4 October 2026.

Keywords:
Artificial Intelligence;
Pancasila-Based Rationality;
Pancasila Philosophy;
Technology Ethics;
Citizenship Paradigm.

ABSTRACT

The development of artificial intelligence (AI) has transformed how society thinks, interacts, and makes decisions. Despite its benefits for efficiency, productivity, and innovation, the dominance of algorithmic rationality may displace human, ethical, and national values if it is not balanced by a moral foundation. This study aims to analyze Pancasila-based rationality as a philosophical paradigm for social life in the AI era and its relationship with technology ethics and digital citizenship. The study employs a philosophical and conceptual approach through a literature review examining Pancasila philosophy, theories of rationality, AI ethics, citizenship, and technology. Interpretive and critical analysis identifies relationships among rationality, morality, and social dynamics. The findings indicate that Pancasila-based rationality integrates the values of belief in God, humanity, unity, democracy, and social justice as foundations for ethical decision-making and responsible AI use. This paradigm provides a normative basis for balancing technological progress with the protection of human dignity and the public interest. These findings may inform the development of Pancasila and Citizenship Education (PPKn) curricula that integrate AI literacy, digital ethics, and critical reasoning.

Keywords:
Kecerdasan Buatan;
Rasionalitas Berbasis Pancasila;
Filsafat Pancasila;
Etika Teknologi;
Paradigma Kewarganegaraan.

ABSTRACT

Rasionalitas Berbasis Pancasila dalam Kehidupan Sosial pada Era Kecerdasan Buatan: Rekonstruksi Paradigma Kewarganegaraan melalui Filsafat Pancasila. *Perkembangan kecerdasan buatan (Artificial Intelligence/AI) telah mengubah cara masyarakat berpikir, berinteraksi, dan mengambil keputusan. Meskipun meningkatkan efisiensi, produktivitas, dan inovasi, dominasi rasionalitas algoritmik berpotensi menggeser nilai kemanusiaan, etika, dan kebangsaan tanpa landasan moral yang kuat. Penelitian ini bertujuan menganalisis rasionalitas berbasis Pancasila sebagai paradigma filosofis kehidupan sosial pada era AI serta keterkaitannya dengan etika teknologi dan kewarganegaraan digital. Penelitian menggunakan pendekatan filosofis-konseptual melalui kajian literatur tentang filsafat Pancasila, rasionalitas, etika AI, kewarganegaraan, dan teknologi. Analisis interpretatif-kritis digunakan untuk mengkaji hubungan rasionalitas, moralitas, dan dinamika sosial. Hasil kajian menunjukkan bahwa rasionalitas berbasis Pancasila mengintegrasikan nilai ketuhanan, kemanusiaan, persatuan, kerakyatan, dan keadilan sosial sebagai landasan pengambilan keputusan etis dan penggunaan AI secara bertanggung jawab. Paradigma ini menyeimbangkan kemajuan teknologi dengan perlindungan martabat manusia dan kepentingan publik sekaligus menjadi landasan pengembangan kurikulum Pendidikan Pancasila dan Kewarganegaraan (PPKn) yang mengintegrasikan literasi AI, etika digital, dan penalaran kritis.*

Copyright © 2026 (Yayuk Hidayah et al.). All Rights Reserved

How to Cite : Hidayah, Y., Irianti, N. P., Permatasari, R. Y. A., Trihastuti, M., & Ferrtikasari, N. (2026). Rasionalitas Berbasis Pancasila dalam Kehidupan Bermasyarakat Era Artificial Intelligence: Rekonstruksi Paradigma Kewargaan Berbasis Filsafat Pancasila. *Rhizome : Jurnal Kajian Ilmu Humaniora*, *6*(1), 12–21. https://doi.org/10.56393/rhizome.v6i1.4706

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License. Allows readers to read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts of its articles and allow readers to use them for any other lawful purpose. The journal hold the copyright.

Introduction

The development of artificial intelligence (AI) has transformed various aspects of human life, from communication, education, and the economy to governance, with adoption rates increasing significantly across countries. The Artificial Intelligence Index Report 2025 indicates that AI development is accelerating through increased investment, scientific publications, and implementation across strategic sectors. Meanwhile, the OECD reports that more than one-third of people in its member countries used generative AI in 2025, indicating that AI has become part of everyday activities. Alongside these developments, AI has moved beyond technological innovation to shape patterns of thought, decision-making, and social interaction, raising new challenges concerning ethics, human autonomy, justice, and responsibility in social life. From a philosophical perspective, de Miranda et al. (2025) emphasize that human wellbeing is determined not only by material and functional factors but also by existential dimensions, such as meaning in life, identity, belonging, and purpose. These conditions reveal a gap between the rapid development of AI and the availability of normative paradigms capable of ensuring that technology use remains oriented toward human values and the public interest. Research on Pancasila-based rationality is therefore important for reconstructing a citizenship paradigm that integrates advances in AI with the values of belief in God, humanity, democracy, unity, and social justice as an ethical foundation for social life.

These developments have also begun to produce tangible effects on digital society in Indonesia. The use of generative AI to produce text, images, and videos has increased productivity across sectors while raising ethical concerns, including the dissemination of disinformation, manipulated content (deepfakes), copyright infringement, algorithmic bias, and an increased risk of personal data misuse. In education, for example, widespread AI use creates a dilemma between its potential as a learning tool and its possible misuse in ways that undermine academic integrity. In the digital public sphere, social media algorithms also contribute to echo chambers, opinion polarization, and the circulation of unverified information, affecting the quality of public participation in democratic life. These phenomena indicate that the principal challenge of AI development lies not solely in the technology itself but in society's capacity to use it responsibly in accordance with moral values, ethics, and shared interests. Pancasila-based rationality is therefore relevant as a philosophical paradigm that can provide a normative foundation for directing AI use toward respect for human dignity, stronger social cohesion, and democratic and just social life.

Various AI applications have increased efficiency and productivity in education, the economy, public services, and governance. However, they have also raised ethical concerns involving algorithmic bias, personal data misuse, digital disinformation, diminished human autonomy, and weakened moral judgment in decision-making. Previous studies generally propose approaches to AI ethics grounded in universal principles, such as fairness, accountability, transparency, and human-centered AI. Relatively few, however, examine paradigms of rationality rooted in a nation's philosophical and cultural values as a normative foundation for social life. This gap points to the need for an alternative paradigm that goes beyond instrumental rationality to integrate moral, social, and spiritual dimensions into AI use. In contrast to universal paradigms of technology ethics, Pancasila-based rationality treats belief in God, humanity, unity, democracy, and social justice as an integrated whole that guides thinking, decision-making, and action in social life. This argument aligns with Garratt and Piper (2012), who emphasize the importance of philosophical reflection in citizenship education, and Tang et al. (2025), who demonstrate that philosophical foundations remain central to governance formulation amid scientific and technological development. Accordingly, this study addresses a conceptual gap by reconstructing a paradigm of rationality grounded in Pancasila philosophy as a normative framework for guiding the ethical, humane, and equitable development and use of AI in social life.

In social life in the era of artificial intelligence, these issues indicate that technological progress requires both sophisticated systems and a form of rationality capable of directing their use toward human interests. Rationality oriented exclusively toward technical efficiency risks overlooking morality, humanity, and social justice. A philosophical paradigm grounded in Pancasila is therefore needed to guide responses to AI development. As both the foundation of the state and the nation's philosophy of life, Pancasila offers a framework of rationality that integrates logical, ethical, and national dimensions. This framework directs AI use toward technological innovation, the protection of human dignity, the strengthening of democracy, the realization of social justice, and the preservation of social life consistent with Pancasila values. On this basis, this article examines Pancasila-based rationality in social life in the AI era through a philosophical and conceptual inquiry. It explains how Pancasila values can provide a normative foundation for directing the development and use of AI in ethical, responsible ways that serve shared interests.

In Indonesia, Pancasila occupies a strategic position as the foundation of the state and the nation's philosophy of life, encompassing the values of belief in God, humanity, unity, democracy, and social justice. As the nation's ideology and guide to life, Pancasila provides a foundation for national and state affairs and normative direction for developing citizens' character in response to social change and technological development. Sianturi and Dewi (2021) emphasize that implementing Pancasila values in everyday life is an important foundation for character formation, enabling individuals to adopt responsible attitudes and make responsible decisions amid societal change, including digital transformation. This view aligns with Whyman (2025), who presents philosophy as a means of critical reflection for evaluating social, moral, and political issues, and Matthews (2023), who emphasizes that scientific and technological development requires a philosophical foundation to provide clear epistemological and ethical direction. Furthermore, Prasad and Sen (2026) demonstrate that local philosophical traditions can offer holistic perspectives by integrating dimensions of life that are often treated as dichotomies. Thus, Pancasila serves both as a normative foundation and as a philosophical paradigm that integrates rationality, morality, and national values in responding to the challenges of digital society and AI development.

Research on AI has largely focused on technical aspects, governance, technology ethics, and regulation. Through a co-word analysis of scientific publications on AI, Courtial and Law (1989) demonstrate that AI has developed into a scientific field with a relatively coherent intellectual structure and research themes. As the field has developed, AI research has expanded to encompass human rights, privacy protection, digital governance, and human-centered AI, which places human values at the center of technological development. Meanwhile, studies of Pancasila generally focus on strengthening national character, citizenship education, democracy, and the implementation of Pancasila values in social life. Nevertheless, few studies specifically integrate Pancasila-based rationality with AI development as a philosophical paradigm for social life. Most studies continue to position Pancasila as a normative foundation without elaborating how its values constitute a framework of rationality capable of guiding the ethical, equitable, and responsible use of AI.

This article offers an original scholarly contribution through the conceptual construction of Pancasila-based rationality as a philosophical paradigm for social life in the AI era. Unlike previous studies that discuss Pancasila and AI separately, this article integrates rationality, Pancasila values, and the dynamics of social life into a single conceptual framework that explains how technological rationality can be balanced with Pancasila-based morality. The article thus strengthens philosophical discourse on Pancasila in response to digital transformation and contributes conceptually to the development of citizenship ethics in the AI era.

Based on the foregoing discussion, the development of artificial intelligence requires both the capacity to adapt to technological progress and a philosophical foundation that can guide technology use so that it remains aligned with human and national values. In this context, Pancasila-based

rationality warrants examination as a paradigm that integrates rational and moral dimensions in social life. Accordingly, this study addresses two research questions: (1) How can Pancasila-based rationality be conceptually constructed as a paradigm for social life in the era of artificial intelligence? and (2) What are the implications of Pancasila-based rationality for the humane, democratic, and equitable use of artificial intelligence in social life?

This study aims to construct the concept of Pancasila-based rationality as a philosophical paradigm for social life in the era of artificial intelligence and to analyze its implications for guiding AI use in accordance with the values of belief in God, humanity, unity, democracy, and social justice, thereby supporting a humane, democratic, and just society.

Method

This study employs library research grounded in philosophical and conceptual inquiry to construct a paradigm of Pancasila-based rationality for social life in the era of artificial intelligence (AI). Data were collected through systematic literature searches in scientific databases, including Scopus, Web of Science, Google Scholar, and Garuda, as well as academic books, policy documents, and reports from credible institutions addressing Pancasila philosophy, theories of rationality, technology ethics, digital citizenship, and AI development. Literature selection proceeded in stages using a descriptive approach that adapted PRISMA's transparency principles. The first stage identified literature using the keywords Pancasila, rationality, artificial intelligence, AI ethics, digital citizenship, and combinations of related terms. The second stage screened titles and abstracts and removed duplicate documents and those unrelated to the research focus. The third stage assessed eligibility through full-text reading, considering substantive relevance, source credibility, publication recency, and contribution to the conceptual framework. Priority was given to primary references and reputable scientific publications from the past ten years, without excluding classic works that provide philosophical foundations. Literature meeting all criteria was then analyzed in depth as the study's principal source material. Data analysis involved thematic classification; philosophical interpretation of the main concepts through a hermeneutic approach; critical analysis of the relationships among rationality, Pancasila philosophy, and AI ethics; and conceptual synthesis to reconstruct the paradigm of Pancasila-based rationality in the context of AI development. Conceptual validity was maintained through theoretical triangulation, comparing perspectives from philosophy, technology ethics, and digital citizenship, alongside a critical evaluation of argumentative consistency. This process produced a coherent, logical conceptual construction with a strong philosophical foundation as a normative framework for the ethical, humane, and equitable development and use of AI.

Results and Discussion

The findings indicate that Pancasila-based rationality is a paradigm that combines rational and moral dimensions in social life. This finding emerges from a conceptual synthesis of literature on Pancasila philosophy, theories of rationality, technology ethics, citizenship, and AI development. Whereas instrumental rationality emphasizes effectiveness, efficiency, and the optimization of outcomes, Pancasila-based rationality directs the use of reason so that it remains grounded in belief in God, humanity, unity, democracy, and social justice. Rationality is thus understood not only as the capacity for logical thinking but also as the capacity to consider the ethical and social consequences of every decision.

Interpretation of the findings indicates that AI development has shifted decision-making from the predominance of human judgment toward the predominance of algorithms. Noonan (2019) explains that the accelerating development of digital technology encourages increasing numbers of social, economic, political, and even military processes to operate through algorithms designed to respond instantly, potentially narrowing the space for human deliberation and reflection. Meanwhile, Gregory and Laverty (2022) emphasize that philosophical thinking is a reflective process that enables

individuals to consider reasons, values, and moral implications before making decisions. These perspectives suggest that technological progress must be balanced with the capacity for critical reflection so that it does not diminish human autonomy or ethical responsibility in social life. Pancasila-based rationality can therefore be positioned as a philosophical framework that integrates rational thinking with moral values, humanity, and social responsibility, orienting technology use toward efficiency as well as the common good, justice, and shared wellbeing.

This finding aligns with Pancasila philosophy, which views human beings as both individuals and social beings who must develop and exercise reason responsibly. From the perspective of educational philosophy, Alfariz and Permatasari (2026) emphasize that strengthening moral feeling is an important foundation for character formation because it enables individuals to understand moral values rationally, internalize them, and implement them in everyday life. This perspective reinforces the idea that rationality cannot be separated from ethical dimensions and human values. Similarly, Dartey (2026) demonstrates that resolving contemporary problems requires philosophical frameworks rooted in local values and epistemologies, while Dunaj et al. (2026) emphasize that rationality is always connected to historical and cultural contexts and power relations and therefore cannot be understood as a neutral instrument. Swer (2023), in turn, explains that philosophical paradigms develop through the critical reinterpretation and reconstruction of existing concepts to address the challenges of their time. Drawing on these perspectives, this article proposes Pancasila-based rationality as a conceptual extension of theories of rationality that have predominantly been understood in instrumental or communicative terms. This concept integrates logical, ethical, and national dimensions in responding to AI development, ensuring that decision-making is oriented toward efficiency, justice, humanity, unity, and shared interests.

Various AI applications offer substantial efficiency and productivity gains across fields ranging from education and the economy to public services and governance. However, these developments also raise ethical concerns, such as algorithmic bias, personal data misuse, digital disinformation, diminished human autonomy, and the weakening of human values in decision-making. In citizenship education, Fadila et al. (2026) emphasize that digital transformation must be balanced with stronger global competence, openness to diversity, digital communication skills, and character formation grounded in human values. Similarly, Garratt and Piper (2012) argue that citizenship education must go beyond developing practical skills to build philosophical and reflective thinking as a foundation for responsible decision-making. Tang et al. (2025) reinforce this perspective by demonstrating that philosophical foundations continue to play an important role in shaping governance and public policy amid the complexity of scientific and technological development.

AI development has brought fundamental changes to how people obtain information, build social relationships, work, learn, and make decisions. AI no longer functions merely as a technological instrument that helps complete tasks; it has become part of knowledge production and the formation of human behavioral patterns. AI's ability to process data, generate information, provide recommendations, and predict possibilities makes people increasingly dependent on algorithm-based systems in their everyday activities. This situation creates both opportunities and new problems, especially when AI-generated information is accepted without verification or critical judgment. The ability to use AI effectively must therefore be balanced with the capacity to assess the accuracy of information, understand algorithmic limitations, consider the consequences of technology use, and distinguish between decisions that can be delegated to machines and those that still require human judgment. Rationality is important in this context because AI use is never entirely technical. Every use of technology involves choices about what is considered true, good, fair, safe, and beneficial to human life.

These issues become more complex when AI is used in social settings characterized by diverse values, interests, and backgrounds. AI-generated information can influence how a person understands an issue, forms opinions, adopts positions, and makes decisions that affect others. Rationality therefore cannot be understood solely as the capacity to think logically on the basis of data and information; it must also encompass reflection on the purposes, values, and consequences of an action. This form of

rationality requires a balance between instrumental considerations of technological effectiveness and substantive considerations of human values. In a democratic society, AI use should promote efficiency while strengthening responsibility, respect for human rights and dignity, openness, participation, and justice in collective life. AI should thus be positioned as a means of supporting human capacities rather than fully replacing human reasoning, moral responsibility, and decision-making.

This perspective places AI use within a broader framework concerned with developing and using technology without displacing human beings as the principal agents of social life. Pancasila-based rationality in AI use therefore goes beyond asking whether a technology can be used effectively and efficiently. It also asks whether its use respects human dignity, strengthens unity, promotes democratic decision-making, prevents discrimination, and distributes benefits equitably across society. On this basis, the relationships among Pancasila values, dimensions of rationality, and their relevance to social life in the AI era need to be mapped systematically, as presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Synthesis of Pancasila-Based Rationality in Social Life in the Era of Artificial Intelligence

Pancasila Value	Meaning of Pancasila-Based Rationality	Implementation in the Era of Artificial Intelligence	Implications for Social Life
Belief in the One and Only God	Rationality grounded in ethics and moral responsibility.	AI development and use consider ethics, integrity, and accountability.	Promotes AI use that respects moral values and human dignity.
Just and Civilized Humanity	Rationality prioritizes respect for human rights, dignity, and wellbeing.	AI is developed through a human-centered approach that considers privacy, data security, and justice.	Prevents algorithmic discrimination and strengthens the protection of citizens' rights.
The Unity of Indonesia	Rationality strengthens social cohesion and national identity.	AI expands inclusive access to information and strengthens constructive social interaction.	Strengthens unity and reduces polarization in digital spaces.
Democracy Guided by the Wisdom of Deliberation among Representatives	Rationality is expressed through critical, dialogic, and participatory decision-making.	AI supports public deliberation, digital public services, and citizen participation.	Improves the quality of digital democracy and public participation.
Social Justice for All the People of Indonesia	Rationality seeks an equitable distribution of technological benefits across society.	AI is used fairly and without bias, supporting equitable access to technology and public services.	Promotes inclusive, equitable, and sustainable social life.

Table 1 demonstrates that Pancasila-based rationality serves not merely as a moral guide to AI use but also as a philosophical paradigm integrating ethics, humanity, democracy, and social justice in social life. Whereas instrumental rationality emphasizes efficiency, optimization, and algorithmic accuracy, Pancasila-based rationality holds that rational decisions must consider moral consequences, human dignity, and shared interests. Each principle of Pancasila thus forms part of an interconnected value system that directs the development and use of AI toward human wellbeing.

Although Pancasila-based rationality offers a comprehensive normative framework for the development and use of AI, its implementation in the digital sphere continues to face several challenges. With regard to belief in God, some technology industries prioritize efficiency, innovation, and economic profit, often sidelining ethical considerations. In terms of humanity, algorithmic bias, personal data misuse, and weak privacy protections continue to threaten human rights and dignity.

From the perspective of unity, widespread disinformation, echo chambers, and polarization in digital media can weaken social cohesion and intensify societal fragmentation. The implementation of democratic values, meanwhile, faces challenges from low digital literacy, limited algorithmic transparency, and potential manipulation of public opinion, which can reduce the quality of democratic participation. Regarding social justice, unequal access to technology, disparities in digital infrastructure, and the concentration of control over AI among particular groups or companies risk widening social and economic inequalities. Realizing Pancasila-based rationality therefore requires collaboration among government, educational institutions, society, and technology developers so that Pancasila values serve as a normative foundation and are implemented in an ethical, inclusive, and equitable digital ecosystem.

Theoretically, this synthesis extends scholarship on Pancasila philosophy by positioning Pancasila-based rationality as a normative paradigm within discourse on technology ethics. Discussions of AI ethics have largely been dominated by universal approaches, such as human-centered AI, trustworthy AI, fairness, accountability, and transparency. This study offers a different perspective by showing that these principles can be enriched through Pancasila values, which integrate belief in God, humanity, unity, democracy, and social justice into a unified philosophical whole. Pancasila-based rationality thus complements globally established paradigms of AI ethics and provides a contextual conceptual framework consistent with Indonesia's social and cultural characteristics.

Practically, the synthesis provides direction for stakeholders in designing more responsible AI governance. For government, this paradigm can inform AI policies and regulations that promote innovation while ensuring the protection of citizens' rights, digital justice, and public accountability. For educational institutions, Pancasila-based rationality can be integrated into citizenship education and digital literacy to develop critical thinking and ethical awareness in AI use. For technology developers and industry, the paradigm provides guidance for designing AI systems that are more inclusive, transparent, free from algorithmic discrimination, and respectful of human dignity.

These findings affirm that AI development cannot rely solely on technical and economic considerations; it also requires a philosophical foundation capable of balancing technological innovation with human values. In this context, Pancasila-based rationality offers a citizenship paradigm that positions human beings as the principal agents of technological development rather than merely as objects of automation. The study's main contribution therefore lies in reconstructing a paradigm of rationality grounded in Pancasila philosophy as a conceptual framework that enriches scholarship on AI ethics and provides a normative foundation for humane, democratic, and equitable technology governance in social life.

Based on this conceptual construction, the principal implication of Pancasila-based rationality is a more humane, democratic, and equitable paradigm of AI use. The findings indicate that AI development should be assessed not only through gains in productivity and efficiency but also through its effects on social life, citizens' rights, and the preservation of national values. This idea aligns with Permatasari et al. (2025), who emphasize that convergence between digital and traditional knowledge can generate new forms of wisdom through hybrid approaches rooted in cultural values. Gasteiger (2026) reinforces this perspective by presenting rationality as a process of critical reflection that connects knowledge with normative considerations, showing that scientific progress cannot be separated from ethical responsibility. Furthermore, Gruengard (2023) emphasizes that philosophical practice in addressing everyday problems requires rational reasoning that considers context, values, and social realities. Dartey (2026), meanwhile, demonstrates that contemporary problems require philosophical frameworks rooted in local values and epistemologies rather than exclusively technical approaches. AI use should therefore strengthen society's critical reasoning, encourage ethical decision-making, respect human dignity, and expand citizens' participation in the digital public sphere, while retaining Pancasila values as a philosophical and moral foundation.

This interpretation indicates that Pancasila functions as an ethical paradigm capable of regulating the dominance of algorithmic rationality in social life in the AI era. In digital life, Permatasari et al. (2025) emphasize the importance of strengthening ethics in public and digital spaces as a foundation for developing responsible citizenship behavior oriented toward shared interests. This perspective aligns with Burns (2024), who explains that resolving philosophical problems requires rational dialogue grounded in critical reflection on values and conceptual foundations rather than merely instrumental considerations. Francis et al. (2026) further demonstrate that ethical decision-making must consider moral complexity, power relations, and human dignity, while Tanchuk et al. (2026) emphasize that artificial superintelligence literacy requires a philosophical foundation to keep technological development oriented toward ethical, epistemological, and social considerations.

From these perspectives, Pancasila-based rationality serves both as a normative foundation and as a philosophical paradigm that guides society in responding critically and responsibly to AI development. If AI is developed solely according to the logic of efficiency and algorithmic optimization, it risks overlooking humanity, justice, and social responsibility. When developed on the basis of Pancasila-based rationality, however, AI can strengthen social life through decision-making that respects human dignity, upholds democracy, reduces potential discrimination and social inequality, and advances the common good in accordance with the values of belief in God, humanity, unity, democracy, and social justice.

This paradigm can be translated into practical digital citizenship through citizens' ethical, critical, and responsible use of AI. Such practices include verifying AI-generated information before sharing it; protecting privacy and personal data security; avoiding the use of AI to produce disinformation, hate speech, or digital manipulation; and using AI for collaboration, innovation, and the resolution of social problems in the public interest. Pancasila-based rationality thus moves beyond an abstract principle to guide everyday decision-making in digital spaces, placing moral responsibility above the pursuit of technological efficiency alone.

These implications also require systematic and sustained strategies for public education. In formal education, AI literacy grounded in Pancasila values needs to be integrated into Pancasila and Citizenship Education (PPKn) through case studies, ethical dilemmas, project-based learning, and critical analysis of AI use in various social contexts. In nonformal education and the wider community, educational strategies can include digital literacy programs, training in the ethics of AI use, public campaigns on responsible AI use, and collaboration among government, educational institutions, digital communities, and the technology industry to build a culture of digital citizenship grounded in Pancasila values. Through these strategies, society can acquire technical competence in using AI while developing the reflective and moral capacities needed to ensure that technological development continues to support human dignity, social justice, and national interests.

The theoretical contribution of this study lies in developing the Pancasila-Based Rationality Framework, a conceptual framework that positions Pancasila as the basis for integrating rationality, morality, and technology. This framework shifts the understanding of rationality, which has largely been dominated by technical perspectives, toward a form grounded in national and human values. The article thereby extends discourse on Pancasila philosophy and contributes to scholarship on AI ethics and citizenship education in Indonesian society.

Conclusion

This study concludes that Pancasila-based rationality is a relevant philosophical paradigm for social life in the era of artificial intelligence (AI). It addresses the need for a normative framework that goes beyond instrumental rationality based on efficiency and optimization to integrate belief in God, humanity, unity, democracy, and social justice as foundations for decision-making and technology use. The study's scholarly contribution lies in reconstructing a paradigm of rationality grounded in Pancasila philosophy as a conceptual framework that enriches discourse on AI ethics and digital

citizenship through a contextual perspective consistent with Indonesia's social, cultural, and national characteristics. Pancasila-based rationality can thus inform AI governance oriented toward technological progress, the protection of human dignity, the public interest, and shared wellbeing. Based on these findings, the study recommends three directions for implementation. First, policymakers and government should formulate regulations, ethical standards, and AI governance mechanisms that integrate Pancasila values as normative principles for the development, implementation, and oversight of AI technology in Indonesia. Second, educators and academics should strengthen Pancasila and Citizenship Education (PPKn) curricula and higher education by integrating AI literacy, digital ethics, and Pancasila-based critical reasoning, alongside empirical research to test the effectiveness of this paradigm in shaping digital citizenship character. Third, technology developers should adopt an ethics-by-design approach that uses Pancasila values as a reference from algorithm design, data management, bias mitigation, and system transparency through to the evaluation of AI's social impacts. This approach can keep technological innovation oriented toward human wellbeing, social justice, and national interests.

References

Alfariz, F., & Permatasari, R. Y. A. (2026). Revitalisasi *moral feeling* Thomas Lickona melalui estetika musik etnik: Sebuah pendekatan filsafat pendidikan berbasis budaya [*Thomas Lickona's revitalization of moral feeling through ethnic music aesthetics: A culture-based educational philosophy approach*]. *Jurnal Filsafat Indonesia, 9*(2). https://doi.org/10.23887/jfi.v9i2.93054

Burns, T. (2024). *MacIntyre and Hegel on the possibility of resolving philosophical disagreements*. *Philosophy & Social Criticism, 51*(9). https://doi.org/10.1177/01914537231215713

Courtial, J.-P., & Law, J. (1989). A Co-Word Study of Artificial Intelligence. *Social Studies of Science*, *19*(2), 301-311. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/030631289019002

Dartey, E. A. (2026). *Languages are not the problem: Re-thinking language planning in post-colonial Ghana through African and Africana philosophical frameworks*. *Journal of Asian and African Studies, 61*(4), 3112–3128. https://doi.org/10.1177/00219096251365487

Dartey, E. A. (2026). *Languages are not the problem: Re-thinking language planning in post-colonial Ghana through African and Africana philosophical frameworks*. *Journal of Asian and African Studies, 61*(4), 3112–3128. https://doi.org/10.1177/00219096251365487

de Miranda, L., Ingvolstad Malmgren, C., Carroll, J. E., Gould, C. S., King, R., Funke, C., & Arslan, S. (2025). The philosophical health compass: A new and comprehensive assessment tool for researching existential dimensions of wellbeing. *Methodological Innovations*, *18*(3), 129-142.DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/20597991251352420

Dunaj, Ľ., Wagner, P., Kögler, H.-H., Outhwaite, W., & Schelkshorn, H. (2026). *Rethinking European modernity: Reason, power and coloniality in early modern thought*. *European Journal of Social Theory*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/13684310261439737

Fadila, A. K., Hidayah, Y., & Trihastuti, M. (2026). *Strengthening global competence through sister school programs*. *Jurnal Kependidikan, 10*(1). https://doi.org/10.21831/jk.v10i1.91399

Francis, D., Priyadarshini, R. G., & Jena, L. K. (2026). *Rethinking ethical leadership: A philosophical anthropology of moral complexity and organizational power*. *Leadership, 22*(3), 161–183. https://doi.org/10.1177/17427150261435530

Garratt, D., & Piper, H. (2012). Citizenship education and philosophical enquiry: Putting thinking back into practice. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, *7*(1), 71-84.DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/17461979114325

Gasteiger, T. L. (2026). *Critical theory, transcendental phenomenology, and the status of reason: Horkheimer and Habermas on Husserl's idea of rigorous philosophical science*. *Philosophy & Social Criticism*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/01914537261438157

Gregory, M. R., & Laverty, M. J. (2022). Frog and Toad at the Academy: Gareth B. Matthews on how children's literature goes philosophical. *Policy Futures in Education*, *20*(3), 297-315.DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/14782103211062

Gruengard, O. (2023). *Philosophical practice and Agassi's approach to practical affairs*. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences, 53*(6), 456–470. https://doi.org/10.1177/00483931231200688

Hidayah, Y., Permatasari, R. Y. A., & Irianti, N. P. (2026). Dari nongkrong ke networking: Budaya kafe sebagai ruang produksi karakter identitas anak muda di era platformisasi digital. *Jurnal Citizenship Virtues, 6*(1), 10–22. https://doi.org/10.37640/jcv.v6i1.2708

Matthews, M. R. (2023). *Cultural studies in science education: A philosophical appraisal*. *Cultures of Science, 6*(2), 199–213. https://doi.org/10.1177/20966083231173721

Noonan, J. (2019). Paul Virilio and the temporal conditions of philosophical thinking. *Time & Society*, *28*(2), 763-782. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0961463X1770

Permatasari, R. Y. A., Irianti, N. P., & Hidayah, Y. (2025). *Pendampingan etika pergaulan di ruang publik dan digital bagi generasi muda di Yogyakarta sebagai wujud cinta tanah air*. *Jurnal Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat, 5*(2).

Permatasari, R. Y. A., Risty, A. D. H., Triyoga, A. I., & Kailas, R. C. B. (2025). *Digital-traditional knowledge convergence: How hybrid methodologies generate new forms of wisdom in ethnomusicological research*. *CaLLs (Journal of Culture, Arts, Literature, and Linguistics)*. https://e-journals.unmul.ac.id/index.php/CALLS/article/view/22990

Prasad, S. P., & Sen, R. (2026). *Ardhanarishvara: The socio-philosophical exploration of the idea of androgyne and the fallacy of binary in South Asia*. *History and Sociology of South Asia, 20*(2), 164–183. https://doi.org/10.1177/22308075261439456

Sari, F. M., Marzuki, & Hidayah, Y. (2026). The effectiveness of the implementation of project-based learning (PJBL) to improve critical thinking abilities on students' learning interest in the PPKn subject. *Journal of Educational Sciences, 10*(6). DOI: https://doi.org/10.31258/jes.10.6.p.1244-1256

Sianturi, Y. R. U., & Dewi, D. A. (2021). Penerapan nilai-nilai Pancasila dalam kehidupan sehari-hari dan sebagai pendidikan karakter. *Jurnal Kewarganegaraan, 5*(1), 222–231.

Suyato, Oktaviani, L., & Hidayah, Y. (2025). *Global citizenship education in the age of globalisation: The essential role of short-term study abroad*. *Globalisations*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2025.2536302

Swer, G. M. (2023). *Arguments with fictional philosophers: Spengler's Kant and the conceptual foundations of Spengler's early philosophy of history*. *History of the Human Sciences, 36*(3–4), 242–259. https://doi.org/10.1177/09526951231156040

Tanchuk, N. J., Taylor, R. M., et al. (2026). *Philosophical foundations of artificial superintelligence literacy: A scoping review and synthesis*. *Journal of Philosophy of Education, 24*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/14778785261459884

Tang, L., Li, Z., Liu, H., & Jing, Y. (2025). Appraising the philosophical influences on modern public administration research. *Public Policy and Administration*, *40*(3), 513-531.DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/09520767241266774

Whyman, T. (2025). *Two sorts of philosophical therapy: Ordinary language philosophy, social criticism and the Frankfurt school*. *Philosophy & Social Criticism, 51*(6), 951–970. https://doi.org/10.1177/01914537231203525